### PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

To:			PCT		
see form	PCT/ISA/220		WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)  Date of mailing (day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)		
Applicant's or agent's file see form PCT/ISA/2			FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below		
International application PCT/GB2004/00156		International filing date (d. 08.04.2004	ay/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year) 09.04.2003	
International Patent Class A47K13/30, E03D9/		both national classification a	and IPC		
Applicant KELLY, Joseph Ste	ven				
<ul> <li>Box No. I</li> <li>Box No. II</li> <li>Box No. III</li> <li>Box No. IV</li> <li>Box No. V</li> <li>Box No. VI</li> <li>Box No. VII</li> </ul>	Basis of the op Priority Non-establish Lack of unity o Reasoned stat applicability; ci Certain docum Certain defects Certain observ	nent of opinion with rega f invention ement under Rule 43 <i>bis</i> tations and explanations	rd to novelty, inventiv 1(a)(i) with regard to supporting such stat	e step and industrial applicabil novelty, inventive step or indus ement	
If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.  If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.  For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.				nere ree	
		Form PCT/ISA/220.			
Name and mailing addre	ess of the ISA:		Authorized Officer		ches Peterre



European Patent Office - P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2 NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Pays Bas Tel. +31 70 340 - 2040 Tx: 31 651 epo nl Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016

Zuurveld, G

Telephone No. +31 70 340-4545



# WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/GB2004/001564

_	Box	No. I Basis of the opinion			
1.	With the la	With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was field, unless otherwise indicated under this item.			
	į	This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).			
2.	With nece	With regard to any <b>nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence</b> disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:			
	a. type of material:				
		a sequence listing			
		table(s) related to the sequence listing			
	b. for	b. format of material:			
		in written format			
		in computer readable form			
	c. tim	ne of filing/furnishing:			
		contained in the international application as filed.			
		filed together with the international application in computer readable form.			
		furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.			
3.	1	In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.			
4.	Additional comments:				

# WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/GB2004/001564

		JC20 Rec'd PCT/PTO 11 OCT 2005	
E	Box No. II		
1. 🛭	The fo	llowing document has not been furnished:	
	⊠	copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(a)).	
	- 🗆	translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(b)).	
	Conse	equently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has heless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.	
Ż. C	has be	pinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim een found invalid (Rules 43 <i>bis</i> .1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international late indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.	
3. <i>A</i>	Additional observations, if necessary:		

## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. → PCT/GB2004/001564

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability					
The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:					
	the entire international application,				
$\boxtimes$	claims Nos. 9-20				
be	because:				
	the said international application, or the said claims Nos. relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (specify):				
$\boxtimes$	the description, claims or drawings (indicate particular elements below) or said claims Nos. 9-20 are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (specify):				
	see separate sheet				
	the claims, or said claims Nos. are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.				
	no international search report has been established for the whole application or for said claims Nos.				
	the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that:				
	the written form	□ has not been furnished			
		☐ does not comply with the standard			
	the computer readable form	□ has not been furnished			
		☐ does not comply with the standard			
	the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.				
	See separate sheet for further	details			

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Yes: Claims

1-8,21-24

No: Claims

Inventive step (IS)

Yes: Claims

1-8,21-24

No: Claims

Industrial applicability (IA)

Yes:

1-8,21-24

No: Claims

Claims

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

#### Box No. VI Certain documents cited

1. Certain published documents (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 70.10) and /or

2. Non-written disclosures (Rules 43bis.1 and 70.9)

see form 210

#### Re Item III.

1.1 Although claims 1, 9, 14 and 18 have been drafted as separate independent device claims, they appear to relate effectively to the same subject-matter and to differ from each other only with regard to the definition of the subject-matter for which protection is sought and/or in respect of the terminology used for the features of that subject-matter. The aforementioned claims therefore lack conciseness. Moreover, lack of clarity of the claims as a whole arises, since the plurality of independent claims makes it difficult, if not impossible, to determine the matter for which protection is sought, and places an undue burden on others seeking to establish the extent of the protection.

Hence, claims 1, 9, 14 and 18 do not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT.

- 1.2 If an amended set of claims had been filed defining the relevant subject-matter in terms of a single independent claim (claim 1) followed by dependent claims covering features which are merely optional (Rule 6.4 PCT), this objection would have been overcome.
- 1.3 The reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability has been established for independent device claim 1 and its dependent claims since in the opinion of the International Examination Authority these claims form the basis of the invention.
- 1.4 See paragraph 4 of Item V for the reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability for independent claims 9, 14 and 18.

#### Re Item V.

1. The following documents are referred to in this communication:

D1 : US 2002/069456 A1 (KUZNIAR RANDY L) 13 June 2002 (2002-06-13) D2: WO 03/039313 A (KELLY JOSEPH STEVEN) 15 May 2003 (2003-05-15)

2.1 Document D1, which is considered to represent the most relevant state of the art, discloses (cf. the cited passages in the search report):

a toilet seat comprising an annular seat member having an internal duct extending around the central opening in the annular seat member from an inlet formed in the annular seat member for receiving foul air from a toilet pan to an outlet formed in the seat member; at least one filter for arrangement in the duct for deodorising foul air from the toilet pan; and fan means arranged in the duct for creating air flow along the duct through the air filter, wherein the filter is fixed to a cartridge which is removably insertable into the annular seat member through an aperture formed in the outer circumferential side of the annular seat member.

From this, the subject-matter of independent claim 1 differs in that the outlet of the duct is formed in an outer wall of the cartridge which fits in the aperture on insertion of the cartridge into the annular seat member.

- 2.2 The subject-matter of claim 1 is therefore novel (Article 33(2) PCT). The problem to be solved by the present invention may be regarded as simplifying the construction of a ventilated toilet seat.
- 2.3 The solution to this problem proposed in claim 1 of the present application is considered as involving an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT) for the following reasons: it is not suggested in D1 to change the air flow such that the outlet for the filtered air is formed in the cartridge. To come to the toilet seat arrangement of the invention, the skilled person would need to modify the toilet seat of D1 in several non-obvious ways.
- 2.4 Claims 2-8 are dependent on claim 1 and as such also meet the requirements of the PCT with respect to novelty and inventive step.
- 3.1 It is noted, that document D2 discloses a toilet seat which comprises all of the features of claim 1. However, this document is not considered as belonging to the prior art according to Rule 64.1 PCT, see also Rule 64.3 PCT.
- 4. Insofar all of the features of claim 1 are implicitly or explicitly present in independent claims 9, 14 and 18, the assessment for claim 1, see above, would also apply for these independent claims and their dependent claims.

THIS PAGE BLANK (USPTO)